

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated December 18, 2007 and provide the following response thereto. Applicants present this amendment in a sincere effort to place the application in consideration for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In this amendment, Claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 18 have been amended. Claims 19-25 are new. Accordingly, Claims 1-25 are presented for consideration. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 6-8 and Claims 13-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, new Claim 19 recites a method for presenting routing information that includes the claim features of previously examined Claims 1, 5 and 6. New claim 20 includes the claim features of previously examined Claim 7 and depends from Claim 19. New Claim 21 includes all the claim features of previously examined Claims 1, 5 and 8.

New Claim 22 recites an apparatus for indicating information on a screen that includes the claim features of previously examined Claims 11, 12 and 13. New Claim 23 recites an apparatus for indicating information on a screen that includes the claim features of previously examined Claims 11, 12 and 14. New Claim 24 recites an apparatus for indicating information on a screen that includes the claim features of previously examined Claims 11, and 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. SECTION 112

In the Office Action, Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that the phrases “such as” and “and/or” are indefinite.

In response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejections, applicants have amended Claims 5-9 to remove the allegedly indefinite language. Accordingly, the scope of Claims 5-9 are definite.

In view of the amendments to Claims 5-9, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office action, dependent Claims 1-5, 9-12 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noriyuki (JP 09159480). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Noriyuki reference concerns a running guidance apparatus for vehicles. As disclosed in that reference, a guidance route is displayed on a roadmap which is shown on a screen. The guidance route is divided into small sections that are displayed alternately in a bright color and a dark color.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, describes a method for indicating direction using a screen, wherein a pattern of relatively dark and relatively bright sections is moved over the screen. A dynamic first image is generated which provides an impression that the first image at least one of rotates and translates over a substantial width of the screen and varies in at least one of light contrast and structure for suggesting movement. Claims 11 and 18, as amended, describe an apparatus for indicating information on a screen that includes similar features. Support for these features can be found throughout the disclosure and figures, and in particular on page 7, lines 15-18.

As explained in the application, the effect of suggesting movement is obtained by dark and light regions of the pattern moving over substantially the full width of the screen. A moving pattern is described in the application to mean an image on a screen which visually appears to undergo a movement in a direction of, for instance, a longitudinal edge of the screen, preferably relatively fluently (Application, page 4, lines 1-4, FIGS. 3, 5A-C). That is very different from the Noriyuki reference. In Noriyuki, only the guidance route shifts alternately using bright and dark colors. Accordingly, the impression that the whole image is rotating and/or moving is not disclosed nor suggested by the Noriyuki reference.

Advantageously, providing a moving pattern having relatively dark and bright sections relative to each other on a screen is well visible and informative to observers such as vehicular drivers. In addition, moving patterns can provide simple instructions, which can be presented instead of or, additionally to, other visual information. Thus, the moving pattern of the present invention provides information to, for instance, a vehicular driver without him or her losing attention to the road. In addition, patterns of the present invention can be used by some visually impaired people as their peripheral visual field is often found to be still sensitive to such moving patterns.

In contrast, the guidance route of the Noriyuki reference is far less visible or informative to users. In Noriyuki, for example, one has to combine the information of the road with the position of the arrow relative thereto, which makes user interpretation of information provided by Noriyuki device far more complex and difficult to understand. Accordingly, the Noriyuki invention requires the user to turn their attention to the device in order to distinguish whether a directional change should be made. In Applicants invention, using the full screen as an indicator, users only need their peripheral area of visibility to notice and process information from the device without changing direction of their vision.

Furthermore, the Noriyuki reference does not appear to provide clear visible direction signals to users. For example, indications such as “turn left”, “turn right”, and “continue” do not appear present. Accordingly, since a user of Applicants’ invention can focus and

maintain their attention to the road rather than the navigation device for directions, a safer navigation solution for all can be obtained.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5 and 9-10, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 12, 16-18, which depend from Claim 11, are patentable over the art of record by virtue of their dependence. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 2-5, 9-10, 12 and 16-18 define additional patentable subject matter in their own right. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn for at least these reasons.

ADDITIONAL CLAIM

New Claim 25 recites a method for indicating direction using a screen, wherein a first pattern of relatively dark and relatively bright sections is moved over a screen, in a direction in which an observer is to be directed, and a second image comprising routing imaging is provided on the screen, such that a dynamic first image is generated which provides an impression that said first image at least one of rotates and translates over said screen independent from the second image.

Support for these features can be found throughout the specification and in FIGS. 3 and 5A-C. For example, as explained in connection with FIG. 5B, over the second image 13, a first image 8 is displayed, with a pattern 30 of sections 10, 11, 12 that move in an up and/or down direction (Application, page 8, lines 4-14). As such, movement of the generated first image is not directly related to the second image. For example, even without the routing image (second image) displayed on the screen, the first image is movable and can provide information to the user.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with

or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Entry of the amendments to Claims 1, 5-9, 11, 18-25; favourable consideration of Claims 1, 5-9, 11, 18-25, as amended; favourable reconsideration of Claims 2-4, 10, 12-17; and allowance of pending Claims 1-25 are solicited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number provided below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

/bartholomew j. divita/
Bartholomew J. DiVita
Registration No.: 59,803
Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550